

the rules in this little blue book and our House rules, this process is in serious need of review and reform, and that is happening. But the last time we implemented major changes was in 1989, and most observers, as well as most Members, I think, believe that it is time to do more.

I have been saying that for years, and I have been trying to advance constructive proposals for reform of this process through the Committee on Rules, which is the proper venue for these discussions. But I have been blocked in that effort on the Committee on Rules by some of the very people who are now so vigorously urging our committee to ignore our rules.

So on the one hand they seem to be complaining about the constraints of our current rules, while on the other hand they refuse to allow us on the Committee on Rules to plan for changes in the process so we do not fall into these same problems in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my dear friend from Colorado, Mrs. SCHROEDER, inserted some remarks into Tuesday's RECORD, calling on me to resign my current position on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I would suggest to her, in good nature, that I would like nothing more than to relinquish my post on that committee. I could say it the other way, and do the Brer Rabbit and say, "Oh, please, don't fire me from the committee; don't throw me into that briar patch," but the truth is I have served my time there and I would love to move on.

As all Members know, serving there is a difficult and very thankless task. It is no fun, it is extremely hard work, but, again, I am constrained by the very rules of the committee and by my obligation to faithfully discharge my duty to this House, and I will do that.

I would say to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and to all my colleagues who have lambasted our committee in recent days, join me in my attempt to get real reform of the ethics process for the next Congress.

For instance, I have proposed changes to the process that would help to address the problem we seem to be having, where Members of this House, perhaps because they have not read or do not fully understand the committee's current rules, make statements that are misleading and confusing to other Members, and to the public, and to the media.

My proposal would make all Members eligible to serve on the ethics panel, similar to a jury approach, where anyone could be called as needed at any time perhaps. Perhaps, then, Members would pay more attention to the rules.

This type of reform would, I think, ensure that Members become more familiar with the rules and procedures of that committee, which are important, and since they too could be called upon to serve duty there in the future. In that case, then, perhaps they would be a little less likely to excoriate their

colleagues who are currently doing the heavy lifting on that committee.

I have other ideas, all of which are included in House Resolution 346, and I invite my colleagues to look at the proposal and add others to it, and to bring forward ideas of their own, so that we can have the best possible reform of the ethics process.

We have an opportunity to turn all the partisan rancor into a positive force for change, and I hope we do not let that opportunity pass us by. The purpose of the ethics committee is to build a credibility of the institution. When we abuse the rules, we detract from the credibility of the institution and that does no Member or the institution any good.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOLEY of Oregon). Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed theHouse. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed theHouse. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed theHouse. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed theHouse. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana addressed theHouse. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed theHouse. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gen-

tleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. VOLKMER addressed theHouse. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION AND THE WAR ON DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before theHouse once again, I intent to come before theHouse as many times as it takes, to see what we can do as a Congress, as a Nation, as parents, as concerned citizens to see how we can stem the drug epidemic in this country. I cannot think of any greater failure of an administration in my lifetime then the failure of this current administration in addressing and in fact ignoring the problem of drug abuse and drug misuse.

It is a very documentable history. It is a story that began in 1992, and we see the results today in our communities and our streets and our schools and in our homes. What is interesting to note with this chart that I brought here today is the use of illegal drugs and the history of our efforts in that war on drugs.

In 1980, we see where President Reagan took over and said, just say no. And his wife, Nancy Reagan, said, just say no, and provided the leadership to this Nation and to our young people and said, drugs are the wrong way to go. We see the chart from 1980 going down and then we see President Bush and Mrs. Bush, and they continued that policy of just say no, that drugs will destroy lives and drugs will destroy our young people.

Then we see 1992, and the latest statistics are absolutely astounding. We see 1992, when President Clinton took office and he first fired the drug czar. Then he hired Joycelyn Elders, our chief health officer for this Nation, who said, just say maybe, maybe take drugs, kids.

Then we saw the destruction of our interdiction program to stop in a most cost-effective manner drugs at their source. Then finally, in the insult to the highest office in this land, we saw the WhiteHouse failing to curtail the employment of people with admitted recent drug use and drug abuse histories, which just startled me as a member of the committee that investigated that matter. So this is what we see, this is what they did, and this is what we get.

Take this second chart, if you would, teen drug use. These statistics should shock every Member of Congress and every parent and every person in the media, the rampant increase in drug use by our teenagers, 12 to 17 years old. I repeated this yesterday, drug use up 78 percent, marijuana use, not the kind of marijuana of the 1960's and the 1970's, we are talking about more potent, more brain destructive, more